UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
)

LIMITED STATES OF AMEDICA

	Plaintiffs,	Case No. 2:13-cr-00018-JCM-GWF
)	
VS.	}	ORDER
LEON BENZER, et al.	Defendants.	Motion for Leave to File Surreply (118)

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff United States of America's ("Plaintiff") Motion for Leave to File Surreply (#118), filed on May 28, 2013. Defendant Edith Gillespie ("Defendant") filed a Motion to Sever (#104) on May 1, 2013. Plaintiff filed a Response (#109) to the Motion to Sever (#104) on May 14, 2013. Defendant filed a Reply (#111) on May 20, 2013. Plaintiff now moves to file a surreply to Defendant's Reply (#111), alleging Defendant raised new arguments therein. Specifically, Defendant attached an Affidavit (#111-1) to her Reply (#111) that purportedly supports an argument for severance under *United States v. Virgil* that Defendant made in her original Motion (#104).

"A surreply may only be filed by leave of court, and only to address new matters raised in a reply to which a party would otherwise be unable to respond." *Kanvick v. City of Reno*, No. 3:06-cv-00058-RAM, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24719, at *1 n.1 (D. Nev. Mar. 27, 2008). Because Defendant attached the Affidavit to her Reply and not to her original Motion (#104), Plaintiff was unable to address the Affidavit's sufficiency under *Virgil*. Furthermore, the Proposed Surreply (#118-1) addresses only the sufficiency of the Affidavit. Accordingly,

¹561 F.2d 1316 (9th Cir. 1977)

1	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Surreply (#118) is
2	granted.
3	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall file Plaintiff's Proposed
4	Surreply (#118-1).
5	DATED this 30th day of May, 2013.
6	
7	George Foley J
8	GEORGE FOLEY JR. United States Magistrate Judge
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	